

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

CLARENCE EUGENE JONES,

No. 2:18-cv-00815-YY

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

M. ROJAS, et al.,

Defendants.

HERNÁNDEZ, District Judge:

Magistrate Judge You issued a Findings and Recommendation on March 22, 2022, in which she recommends that this Court deny Defendants' motion for summary judgment as to the retaliation claim for money damages regarding the August 22, 2017 conduct order but otherwise grant Defendant's motion. F&R, ECF 223. The matter is now before the Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b).

Plaintiff filed timely objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation. Pl. Obj., ECF 232. When any party objects to any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation, the district court must make a *de novo* determination of that portion of the Magistrate Judge's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Dawson v. Marshall*, 561 F.3d 930, 932 (9th Cir. 2009); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc).


The Court has carefully considered Plaintiff's objections and concludes that there is no basis to modify the Findings & Recommendation. The Court has also reviewed the pertinent portions of the record *de novo* and finds no error in the Magistrate Judge's Findings & Recommendation.

CONCLUSION

The Court adopts Magistrate Judge You's Findings and Recommendation [223]. Therefore, Defendants' motion for summary judgment [186] is DENIED as to the retaliation claim for money damages regarding the August 22, 2017 conduct order but otherwise GRANTED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: August 25, 2022.


MARCO A. HERNÁNDEZ
United States District Judge